

THE BORDERER'S LEAP.

[illegible]

On the 15th ultimo, at ten o'clock at night, a female, named HARRIS, in Switzerland, set fire to her house, under the idea of driving out evil spirits. She then awoke her husband and secured him of his danger; she next took a table and a great book, and after throwing into a bag containing a gold chain and ring, traversed the village and went to St. Gall, where she was apprehended and taken back to her house. The house was entirely consumed, and it was not without difficulty that the contiguous buildings were saved. Some years ago, a woman named HARRIS, who was a native of Switzerland, was residing in a small house in the village of St. Gall, near the town of Winterthur. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious.

A woman named HARRIS, who was a native of Switzerland, was residing in a small house in the village of St. Gall, near the town of Winterthur. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious.

WATER-FORGETFULNESS.—It gives us no small pleasure to be able to inform the public, that the Lord Advocate has acquiesced in the acquittal of the late Lord Advocate, who was charged with the murder of the late Lord Advocate. The acquittal was a very remarkable one, and was a great relief to the public.

The public at large are making anxious and universal inquiry after the course of murder, and bringing the murderers to justice, and the acquittal of the late Lord Advocate, who was charged with the murder of the late Lord Advocate. The acquittal was a very remarkable one, and was a great relief to the public.

With respect to Burke, he is quite resigned to his awful fate. From information received from various quarters on which we can depend, we can state that the murders perpetrated by him and his gang will exceed a dozen, and will certainly be under a score—a catalogue far too large and horrible to be detailed. The blood of a single murderer is a deplorable stain on the name of man.

This city is no longer polluted with the presence of a female companion, of horrible notoriety, M'Dougal; but where she has gone we have been at no pains to enquire. On Sunday, after her confinement, she was taken to a public house, where she was kept for some time. She was a woman of a very peculiar and eccentric character, and was known to her neighbors as a woman who was very superstitious.

A strong desire is manifest to see the man in which Burke and Hare resided. A sage personage observing that Hare's house was daily visited by great crowds, rented it for a specified time, and shows it for a trifle to visitors. Yesterday forenoon there were seldom fewer than a score waiting their turn for admittance. It is a very remarkable fact, and is a great relief to the public.

CRITERION OF TALENT.—A street-sweeper, the other day, hearing some praises bestowed on the clear state of one of the crossings at which a brother of the same craft officiated, somewhat patulantly observed, "Well now, I don't think him any great shakes after all. He can get through common street-forward jobs well enough, but it isn't what tells a man's abilities. Just put him to a bit of fancy work; let him try to sweep round the posts, and see how he'll manage that!"—Hants Advertiser.

It appears that matters continue in a deplorable state among the ship-owners. The freight from Calcutta to England in August was—Dead weight, £2 10s. per ton; light freight, £4 to £5 ditto. From Bombay, £3 10s. only per ton; and from Singapore, £3 10s. to £3 15s. Many vessels have been chartered at much lower prices, or they would have been obliged to return in ballast.—London Times.

Amongst the most remarkable exploits of English travellers is that of Lieut. M. R. N. who has just returned from a tour in the Cordilleras, which it shall be his lot to narrate, on one of his journeys. He has been to the top of the Cordilleras, and has been to the top of the Cordilleras, and has been to the top of the Cordilleras.

On the 15th ultimo, at ten o'clock at night, a female, named HARRIS, in Switzerland, set fire to her house, under the idea of driving out evil spirits. She then awoke her husband and secured him of his danger; she next took a table and a great book, and after throwing into a bag containing a gold chain and ring, traversed the village and went to St. Gall, where she was apprehended and taken back to her house. The house was entirely consumed, and it was not without difficulty that the contiguous buildings were saved.

The following remarkable events took place at Nyon, in France:—A man named CHAPPEL, who had lived for some time separated from his wife, entered the lodging of the latter, and fired a pistol at her, the ball of which missed his intended victim, and merely broke the candlestick which she had in her hand. He then took from his pocket a large bottle of gunpowder, upon the mouth of which was a piece of German tinder (amadou), and having set light to the tinder, and supposing that the explosion of the gunpowder would destroy his wife, he placed the pistol against his own heart, fired, and instantly ceased to exist. The wife, however, escaped; for the blood rushing out from the wound of the intended murderer extinguished the light, and prevented it from communicating with the gunpowder.

At the Royal Assize, at three New Zealand, brought by Captain to England, were present. They attracted great attention, being in their native costume.

MYSTERIOUS AFFAIR.

The following transaction has excited a very great sensation in this city, and has induced a suspicion that some mysterious disposed to imitate the Edinburgh murders, are lurking about our habitations. On Monday evening week, between eight and nine o'clock, three men, habited as sailors, called at the shop of Mr. Whitehead, a huckster at Walmgate, and enquired if he could inform them where they could procure lodgings. She pointed them to the house on the opposite side of the street; but they told her they had already been there and had not succeeded. She then mentioned to them another house in Paver's-lane, in Walmgate, the way to which they affected not to know. Wishful to render them all the assistance that civility could suggest, she offered her son as a guide, and he accompanied them to the house. Whether it was that some gloomy apprehensions had arisen in the mind of the child, or there was something repulsive in the appearance of the strangers, we cannot say, but the lad objected to undertake the mission, and he was not until the preteritory command of his father had been issued, that he left the protection of her home for the company of these unknown wanderers. When they had arrived in the lane, which is a retired and lonesome spot, one of the villains suddenly seized the youth, and exclaimed, "Is this the door?" whilst he applied a large plaster, seemingly a composition of pitch and tar, to the middle of his forehead. In endeavouring to avoid the violence that was offered him, he averted his head from his assailant, and this act caused the greater part of the plaster to fasten upon his cheek, thus preserving one half of his mouth free for respiration; and, providentially, a girl happened to be standing on the stairs, in the act of passing, and was witness of the horrid transaction. She called out to them to know what they were going to do with the lad? When they hastily tore off the plaster, and ran away. The child was severely hurt by the violence of this operation, and so strongly adhesive had the composition been, that some of it remained on his cheek three days after this occurrence. When the ultimate intentions of these villains might be, we do not pretend to say, but it is evident, that had the plaster taken the effect, the intended suffocation must very shortly have been the result. The dark mystery of the transaction is further heightened from the fact having been ascertained, that these men had actually engaged lodgings prior to their application to Mrs. Whitehead, where they had gone with the infamous preparation in their possession, after a long inspection of her residence from the opposite side of the street. On Tuesday morning, the same three wretches called at the shop, though in a different dress, to exhibit themselves in Walmgate, singing in the middle of the street, as distressed seamen. The child, Whitehead, saw them, and immediately pointed them out as the men who had injured him the preceding night. They soon saw that they were noticed, and that for which ever they were conscious guilt, induced them to make a speedy flight on the Hull road.—York Courier.

COURT OF OYER AND TERMINER.

NEW YORK, MARCH 11. Present:—The Hon. Ogden Edwards, Alderman Stephens, Brown and Coe.

The Court was opened by proclamation made by the High Constable. Catherine Cashier, a colored girl, was put to the bar, having been arraigned for the murder of Susan Saltus, and pleaded not guilty.

Mazwell, District Attorney, for the people. Messrs. M. C. Patterson, McEwen and May, for the prisoner.

The usual formalities having been gone through the names of the jurors were drawn from the ballot box. As they answered, they were successively interrogated as to their having formed an opinion, or challenged. The panel sworn, consisted of the following jurors:

Henry Robertson, Frederick Weed, Rodman G. Day, Benjamin F. Gardner, Thomas Richards, Chester Jennings, William Wilmarth, Edmund Smith, Charles Miller, John North, James Fellows, James Demarest.

The indictment was read to the jury by the Clerk. It contained two counts, in one of which the name of the deceased was set forth as Susan Saltus; the other as Susan Anthony.

The District Attorney opened at one o'clock for the people. He said the case was a simple one; that the circumstances were in a narrow compass; and that the evidence would be conclusive, that a murder had been committed.

John O'Neil, Coroner, sworn. Was called to hold inquest on the body of Susan Saltus, at the corner of Centre and Anthony streets. There was a wound in the body. Witness possessed himself of a jack knife, produced by him, with which was said he had been murdered. Doctors Francis and Anderson were called to examine the body.

John H. P. sworn. M. D. sworn. Is professor of legal medicine; and has paid particular attention to the consequences of wounds. Wounds in the chest are generally put down as fatal. Examined the body of the woman, and found a wound which had perforated the cavity of the chest. The instrument had entered into the left ventricle of the heart. Asked whether such a wound could be inflicted by the knife shown to him. The question was objected to by Patterson; and the objection sustained by the Court, the knife not having been identified.

Julia Cary, shown the knife. Saw it, or a similar one, in the hand of prisoner on the night when she was killed; and after she was stabbed the second time.

Cross. Lives at Leonard-street. Was in deceased's house on the evening of the 7th Feb. having been invited to a card party. Has known her for a year. Does not know what she did for a living. Has seen her in the street and in different houses. Has been to balls where deceased was present. The room is rather large. Prisoner and Maria Coulter were sitting at a table playing cards, when witness went in. Deceased stood by the fire. Susan asked witness to play a game of cards. Prisoner got up, using language, Deceased asked her to stop, and went away. A general acquittal after some time.

Also, a great variety of Writing, Printing, Wrapping and other PAPERS, at the Manufacturer's lowest prices, for cash or approved notes. march 7—t

Prisoner became more abusive than before. Deceased opened the door, and put her hand on the prisoner, as witness believed. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity. Prisoner then struck at deceased, and tore her dress off, and she was left in a state of nudity.

sons, or say any thing about having been turned out of doors by Susan Anthony (alias) Saltus. Mary Woods, (black) sworn. Witness had been in a house, and was not at home when prisoner came there. Witness found prisoner in a state of nudity, and there was a watchman there, looking for her.

Cross. Prisoner did not live with witness, but in a different part of the house. Had seen prisoner have a knife. Saw her picking her nails with it, in Mr. Brush's store, on the evening of the murder. Never heard that she had a quarrel with the deceased.

The Defence now rested. Maxwell now read from Chitty, to show the cases in which death inflicted by sudden passion, is softened into manslaughter; and also to show that the present case does not come within the milder provisions of the law.

Mr. May then proceeded to sum up the defence, and was followed by his associate counsel, Mr. Patterson. And as these gentlemen are both young at the bar, in cases of this character and magnitude, we take occasion to volunteer the remark, that the case was summed up with unusual ability and ingenuity, learning and eloquence. Indeed it was evident, when Mr. Maxwell commenced his argument for the prosecution, that he conceived it necessary, able as he always is, to make an extra effort on this occasion. "Whatever," said he—"Whatever may be the result of this cause—whatever may be the fate of the unhappy prisoner at the bar, it must be admitted on all hands, and I am happy that much is the fact—that she has been defended by degrees of learning, and eloquence, and zeal, which do infinite credit to her counsel."

The pleadings were indeed very able, on both sides. When the District Attorney had closed—His Honour Judge Edwards proceeded to address the jury. The counsel on both sides having discharged their duty with fidelity and great ability, it was necessary to notice the point of view, which the degraded state of the prisoner called for great circumspection. The law however, did not respect persons. Form and abject, degraded, and wretched as she was, it behooves the court particularly to see justice done here. His Honour after having defined murder, observed that it was necessary to notice the point of view, which the degraded state of the prisoner called for great circumspection. The law however, did not respect persons. Form and abject, degraded, and wretched as she was, it behooves the court particularly to see justice done here.

His Honour then read from Archbold's Digest, the several authorities on the different degrees of homicide. His Honor then observed, that when the law states of malice aforethought, it means, yet still there were cases when this particular was not observable, and convictions had ensued. If the offence was of such a character that could not be palliated to no allowance traceable to human frailty, the law pronounced it murder. What was the provocation the prisoner received? It appeared that her husband was exceedingly violent, and that account the deceased requested her to be quiet or to go out; she refused to comply, still continuing her violence and using the language ascribed to her. The deceased then put her hand gently upon the prisoner, upon which she turned and made a stab. It appeared that she made three or four stabs, and the last by the evidence it seems, was the fatal one.

After having thus acted she seized a chair and endeavored to strike the deceased but was prevented—She then went out, walked home and went to bed—from which she was taken when arrested by the watchmen. By this conduct it was evident that she suffered an alienation of mind; but it was evident that it was produced by her liquor she had drunk. The wish to have her leave the room in the presence of company must have been very offensive to the prisoner. But the deceased had a right to do so, and put her hands upon her for that purpose. Whether there was anything in this, making an allowance as previously stated for human frailty, to extenuate the violence of the violence of the prisoner and justify her in so horrid a proceeding, would be matter for their consideration when they had retired to their rooms. The case, like every one of the description, was serious; but, as we are anxious to feel out of the case, it is not such a spectacle, and dreadful the case to pass upon; yet prosecutions of this kind were instituted for the purpose of public example and protecting the welfare of society. In such cases as the present, it was to be expected that appeals to the passions would be forcibly made, but the jury were to be guided by the case, and not by the passions of the moment. The law as regards murder had been in the country for ages, from the dominion of the mother country, until the present period. It was also the law of God, as well as man, and it was imperative upon jurors to administer it faithfully and manfully. It was however in its merciful spirit gave all the benefit of doubt to the prisoner, but that doubt should not be capricious. His Honor concluded by observing that it was competent under this indictment to find either for manslaughter or murder.

The Jury retired at half past nine o'clock, and returned at half past ten with a verdict of WILFUL MURDER.

FOR THE DAILY CHRONICLE. WALNUT STREET THEATRE. The entertainment of last evening was the Stranger, with the delightful farce of A Day after the Wedding. Wood played the Stranger, on the whole, extremely well, and it is properly ranked among his best performances. I have no fault to find with it, but in one part, where he gave us somewhat too much of the outward forms of excessive grief, and cried and mourned in a manner which I can less easily pardon in him than in most others. This is a vile practice; but enough in a female performer, but absolutely intolerable in a man. Wood perhaps caught the infection from his partner in the scene, who seems to think these the only accomplishments worth studying.

How a performer can spend years upon the stage without learning that the sensibilities of an audience can only be excited by correct and feeling elocution, with natural and appropriate action, I cannot conceive; but Miss ENEMY seems to think that when she weeps the spectators must do the same. ROBERTS never played better than in the simpleton Peter, and being the only amusing character in the piece, the audience were always glad to see him. Wray played old Tobias with great feeling and propriety. He is a deserving and useful actor; but, unfortunately, is too often, from necessity, thrust forward in parts not suited to him. GATES deserves credit for his performance of the faithful servant. If he could learn to mind his stops and give more force to his dialogue, he would in time acquire reputation in second-rate parts; but perhaps, like the rest of the race, by that time he will be too old to take any but the first. Miss WARRING appeared to be introduced in the little part of Annette merely for the sake of the song, which is usually assigned to Mrs. Haller, when

the actress can sing. Miss WARRING gave it with sweetness of voice, but feebly. In the farce, Wood and Mrs. BLAKE, as Colonel Proctor and his Lady, were admirable; and the excellence of each seemed to give fresh spirit to the other. It is worth sitting through a long evening, to see two such performers together, at the end of it. They are among the very few of whom it can be said that a full house is not necessary to induce them to do their best; and they may be assured that nothing goes farther towards securing public favour.

COLLEY CIBBER. PHILADELPHIA: FRIDAY EVENING, MARCH 13, 1829.

A meeting of the friends of surgical reform was lately held at LONDON, at which it was resolved to give a dinner to the editor of the LANCET, and to pay his expenses in the action for libelling the nephew of Sir ASTLEY COOPER. The proceedings we notice for the sake of an anecdote which we advise all writing-masters to append to their advertisements. We give it for their benefit. "In the course of the evening the conduct of one of the speakers gave for a short time an amusing turn to the discussion, which for a great part had appeared to many extremely dry and tedious. The gentleman in question (not a medical man), in order to show the opinion he had entertained of the object of the meeting, proposed to read for the audience a letter which he had written to the chairman of the committee, asking permission to attend. He began, but he had scarcely got through a few words when he declared he was not able to make out his own writing, and requested the chairman to assist him. The chairman made the attempt, but was not more successful. Another gentleman then undertook the task, but with no better effect. The audience received each unsuccessful effort with loud laughter, which so much annoyed the writer that he took back the letter, and again tried to go through with it, but not being able to make it out, he proposed to read for the meeting two letters which he wrote on the same subject to the editor of a Sunday paper. (Loud laughter followed this proposition, which was increased, when on an attempt to read one of them, he had no more success than before.) The gentleman, after complaining of the want of courtesy in the meeting, resumed his seat, declaring that he would give the letters to the reporters."

It is curious to observe the effect wrought by the late trials in EDINBURGH, on a great portion of the BRITISH periodical press.—Every thing relating to sudden disappearances of obscure individuals, dead bodies, old bones, coffins, dissections, and body-stealers, is sought out with indefatigable industry, and retailed as the most valuable of all commodities. Scarcely a county in ENGLAND or SCOTLAND has failed to contribute something to the general stock. The SUN reports the following hand-bill, said to have been posted in a public place at WHITEHAVEN.

"Hardy and Company, Second Hand Coffin Warehouse, No. 18, Fox-lane, having been several years agent for supplying Dublin and Edinburgh Colleges with bodies they have had the opportunity of collecting a large assortment of coffins of every size and description, which they propose selling at reduced prices for ready money. Also all kinds of human and other bones, coffins, &c. bought sold, or exchanged.—Orders will be received at the warehouse, or the furniture shop, Market-place. N. B. Best prices given for perfect bodies."

THE proposition lately made by the LAW INSTITUTE of NEW YORK, for the appointment of an assistant, to aid the CHANCELLOR of that state in performing the laborious duties of his office, has brought the COURT of CHANCERY in some measure before the public, as a subject of discussion in the NEW YORK PRESS. A writer in the EVENING POST asserts that the present method of taking testimony is not a less evil than the overwhelling business of the COURT. By the old practice, the examinations were conducted in private, by the examiner, on written interrogatories. Now, the parties, with their counsel, are admitted into the examiner's chamber, with liberty to cross-examine. The writer whom we quote is confident that the members of the bar most versed in CHANCERY practice, would, with one voice declare the present more burdensome to the parties than the old method and less calculated to elicit the simple truth. He argues thus: "In the first place it imposes a very serious charge for counsel fees in attending examinations, which is not a taxable item, but must be submitted to by every suitor, who does mean to give up his controversy. In the next place, it affords opportunity to ingenious counsel, before an officer not possessing the authority of a court, and anxious to secure professional patronage in his business, to puzzle and mislead an unlettered witness, and to extract answers, the words of which, would give a very erroneous picture of his character and meaning, and a very different one from that which a jury would have drawn from his oral testimony. A witness is vexed, annoyed, fatigued, enojed and insulted by a cross examination of some six or nine hours, and in

the course of which, direct affirmative or negative answer, to subtle, involved and ambiguous questions are extorted or wheedled from the witness, the force of which he does not at the moment comprehend, and which serve the purpose of the party, and was probably the object of all his stratagem. Again, by a desultory proceeding of this kind, much irrelevant matter inevitably creeps in, and an examination is spent out to a length far exceeding the limits of propriety, making double the number of folios which an impartial investigation by settled interrogatories would produce. The loss of time to witnesses, to say nothing of the parties and their counsel, far exceeds the old method. Indeed the expense of the present mode is so enormous, that it will deter suitors from this court who are not driven there by inevitable necessity, or if they come it will be at the hazard in many cases of being ruined. It is singular enough that in the prevailing rage for cutting down legal fees, and improving our system of jurisprudence, our Legislature by the one unfortunate alteration alluded to, have done more to increase the expense and burden of litigation than all their curtailings has done towards diminishing them. And all this is for the advantage of no one. To the examiner and witness it is tedious and irksome, to the parties it is grievous, and it imposes a heavy duty on counsel, for which in ordinary cases the counsel ask an adequate compensation. But there is another and a little more serious objection, embracing in a measure those I have just touched on. The present practice affords great opportunities and the strongest inducements to perjury, and the subornation of witnesses. The parties are present and hear what is testified, the interest stimulates them to seek out other testimony and to rebut what makes against them, and the length of time an examination lasts, affords ample leisure for the purpose. In ordinary trials at common law, the witnesses are brought up and all examined at once. No chance is afforded to tamper or suborn. The witnesses confront the parties, and are judged by the court and jury; but in Chancery, their profile only, and that after a caricature, appears from a written deposition. That powerful medium of testing truth a personal observation of the countenance and manner of the witness, is wanting. All the disadvantages of public examinations are felt, without any of their benefits, except perhaps the sifting of a cross examination; the advantage of which is materially diminished by the circumstances before stated. Set in opposition to the evils inseparable from the system, this dwindles into insignificance. Let the examiner be a man of approved intelligence and honesty, and he will not fail to present a more faithful representation of a witness, than is ordinarily produced by the present cavilling and pettifoggish system. It was doubtless from the evil consequences of such a practice that the former custom of private enquiries grew up in England, and was adopted with us. And it is high time the old method was restored, unless we would ruin suitors by appalling expense, and flood the state with perjured testimony. There will always be more than enough, guard against them as we may. The present system invites to subornation, and holds out eventual success as a premium on in commission."

THE proposition lately made by the LAW INSTITUTE of NEW YORK, for the appointment of an assistant, to aid the CHANCELLOR of that state in performing the laborious duties of his office, has brought the COURT of CHANCERY in some measure before the public, as a subject of discussion in the NEW YORK PRESS. A writer in the EVENING POST asserts that the present method of taking testimony is not a less evil than the overwhelling business of the COURT. By the old practice, the examinations were conducted in private, by the examiner, on written interrogatories. Now, the parties, with their counsel, are admitted into the examiner's chamber, with liberty to cross-examine. The writer whom we quote is confident that the members of the bar most versed in CHANCERY practice, would, with one voice declare the present more burdensome to the parties than the old method and less calculated to elicit the simple truth. He argues thus: "In the first place it imposes a very serious charge for counsel fees in attending examinations, which is not a taxable item, but must be submitted to by every suitor, who does mean to give up his controversy. In the next place, it affords opportunity to ingenious counsel, before an officer not possessing the authority of a court, and anxious to secure professional patronage in his business, to puzzle and mislead an unlettered witness, and to extract answers, the words of which, would give a very erroneous picture of his character and meaning, and a very different one from that which a jury would have drawn from his oral testimony. A witness is vexed, annoyed, fatigued, enojed and insulted by a cross examination of some six or nine hours, and in

the course of which, direct affirmative or negative answer, to subtle, involved and ambiguous questions are extorted or wheedled from the witness, the force of which he does not at the moment comprehend, and which serve the purpose of the party, and was probably the object of all his stratagem. Again, by a desultory proceeding of this kind, much irrelevant matter inevitably creeps in, and an examination is spent out to a length far exceeding the limits of propriety, making double the number of folios which an impartial investigation by settled interrogatories would produce. The loss of time to witnesses, to say nothing of the parties and their counsel, far exceeds the old method. Indeed the expense of the present mode is so enormous, that it will deter suitors from this court who are not driven there by inevitable necessity, or if they come it will be at the hazard in many cases of being ruined. It is singular enough that in the prevailing rage for cutting down legal fees, and improving our system of jurisprudence, our Legislature by the one unfortunate alteration alluded to, have done more to increase the expense and burden of litigation than all their curtailings has done towards diminishing them. And all this is for the advantage of no one. To the examiner and witness it is tedious and irksome, to the parties it is grievous, and it imposes a heavy duty on counsel, for which in ordinary cases the counsel ask an adequate compensation. But there is another and a little more serious objection, embracing in a measure those I have just touched on. The present practice affords great opportunities and the strongest inducements to perjury, and the subornation of witnesses. The parties are present and hear what is testified, the interest stimulates them to seek out other testimony and to rebut what makes against them, and the length of time an examination lasts, affords ample leisure for the purpose. In ordinary trials at common law, the witnesses are brought up and all examined at once. No chance is afforded to tamper or suborn. The witnesses confront the parties, and are judged by the court and jury; but in Chancery, their profile only, and that after a caricature, appears from a written deposition. That powerful medium of testing truth a personal observation of the countenance and manner of the witness, is wanting. All the disadvantages of public examinations are felt, without any of their benefits, except perhaps the sifting of a cross examination; the advantage of which is materially diminished by the circumstances before stated. Set in opposition to the evils inseparable from the system, this dwindles into insignificance. Let the examiner be a man of approved intelligence and honesty, and he will not fail to present a more faithful representation of a witness, than is ordinarily produced by the present cavilling and pettifoggish system. It was doubtless from the evil consequences of such a practice that the former custom of private enquiries grew up in England, and was adopted with us. And it is high time the old method was restored, unless we would ruin suitors by appalling expense, and flood the state with perjured testimony. There will always be more than enough, guard against them as we may. The present system invites to subornation, and holds out eventual success as a premium on in commission."

THE proposition lately made by the LAW INSTITUTE of NEW YORK, for the appointment of an assistant, to aid the CHANCELLOR of that state in performing the laborious duties of his office, has brought the COURT of CHANCERY in some measure before the public, as a subject of discussion in the NEW YORK PRESS. A writer in the EVENING POST asserts that the present method of taking testimony is not a less evil than the overwhelling business of the COURT. By the old practice, the examinations were conducted in private, by the examiner, on written interrogatories. Now, the parties, with their counsel, are admitted into the examiner's chamber, with liberty to cross-examine. The writer whom we quote is confident that the members of the bar most versed in CHANCERY practice, would, with one voice declare the present more burdensome to the parties than the old method and less calculated to elicit the simple truth. He argues thus: "In the first place it imposes a very serious charge for counsel fees in attending examinations, which is not a taxable item, but must be submitted to by every suitor, who does mean to give up his controversy. In the next place, it affords opportunity to ingenious counsel, before an officer not possessing the authority of a court, and anxious to secure professional patronage in his business, to puzzle and mislead an unlettered witness, and to extract answers, the words of which, would give a very erroneous picture of his character and meaning, and a very different one from that which a jury would have drawn from his oral testimony. A witness is vexed, annoyed, fatigued, enojed and insulted by a cross examination of some six or nine hours, and in

the course of which, direct affirmative or negative answer, to subtle, involved and ambiguous questions are extorted or wheedled from the witness, the force of which he does not at the moment comprehend, and which serve the purpose of the party, and was probably the object of all his stratagem. Again, by a desultory proceeding of this kind, much irrelevant matter inevitably creeps in, and an examination is spent out to a length far exceeding the limits of propriety, making double the number of folios which an impartial investigation by settled interrogatories would produce. The loss of time to witnesses, to say nothing of the parties and their counsel, far exceeds the old method. Indeed the expense of the present mode is so enormous, that it will deter suitors from this court who are not driven there by inevitable necessity, or if they come it will be at the hazard in many cases of being ruined. It is singular enough that in the prevailing rage for cutting down legal fees, and improving our system of jurisprudence, our Legislature by the one unfortunate alteration alluded to, have done more to increase the expense and burden of litigation than all their curtailings has done towards diminishing them. And all this is for the advantage of no one. To the examiner and witness it is tedious and irksome, to the parties it is grievous, and it imposes a heavy duty on counsel, for which in ordinary cases the counsel ask an adequate compensation. But there is another and a little more serious objection, embracing in a measure those I have just touched on. The present practice affords great opportunities and the strongest inducements to perjury, and the subornation of witnesses. The parties are present and hear what is testified, the interest stimulates them to seek out other testimony and to rebut what makes against them, and the length of time an examination lasts, affords ample leisure for the purpose. In ordinary trials at common law, the witnesses are brought up and all examined at once. No chance is afforded to tamper or suborn. The witnesses confront the parties, and are judged by the court and jury; but in Chancery, their profile only, and that after a caricature, appears from a written deposition. That powerful medium of testing truth a personal observation of the countenance and manner of the witness, is wanting. All the disadvantages of public examinations are felt, without any of their benefits

